

Price 10 cents.

ADDRESS

BY

HON. EDWARD BLAKE, M. P.

DELIVERED IN



BOSTON MUSIC HALL

WEDNESDAY EVENING, JANUARY 31, 1894.

PUBLISHED BY
THE MUNICIPAL COUNCIL OF THE IRISH NATIONAL FEDERATION
OF BOSTON AND VICINITY.



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2009 with funding from
Ontario Council of University Libraries

A SKETCH OF MR. BLAKE'S CAREER.

THE Hon. Edward Blake, Q. C., LL. D., and now a member of the British House of Commons, was born at Adelaide, Ontario, Canada, Oct. 13, 1833. He became M. A. of Toronto University in 1858, began the study of law in 1859, and in 1864 became a Queen's Counsel. In 1867 he was elected to the Ontario Legislature, and afterward to the Dominion Parliament, and in 1871-1872 was Premier of Ontario. He retained this position only one session, being obliged to resign it on account of the Dual Representation act. In 1873 also he became a member of the Canadian Cabinet under the Mackenzie administration, serving for various periods as Minister of Justice and President of the Council. The Chancellorship of Ontario and the Chief Justiceship of the Supreme Court of the Dominion were offered to him, but he declined both. In 1878 he, with many other members of his party, was defeated for re-election, but he re-entered Parliament in the following year and was for years afterward recognized as the leader of the Liberal party. He was chosen Chancellor of the University of Toronto in 1876, and has been repeatedly elected since. He declined a knighthood in 1877, and in 1889 had the degree of LL. D. conferred on him by the University of Toronto. At the last general British and Irish elections he was elected M. P. for the County Longford, Ireland, which he now ably represents in the House of Commons, London.

What the Most Rev. Archbishop Walsh of Toronto says of Mr. Blake.

THE Most Rev. John Walsh, Archbishop of Toronto, recently directed that a collection for the purposes represented by Mr. Blake be taken up in all the churches of the archdiocese on Quinquagesima Sunday. In the circular to the clergy announcing this collection, he says of Ireland's appeal and of the champion Canada has given her:—

"This appeal is not only sanctioned, but is urged as a matter of the last importance by the Hon. Edward Blake, who, with all the earnestness, zeal, and enthusiasm of a knight of old, has devoted his time and talents to the cause of Home Rule in Ireland.

"The sacrifices of time and money, and of personal ease and comfort made by this distinguished gentleman for the liberty, prosperity, and happiness of Ireland are certainly stimulating and encouraging, and loudly call, not alone for our admiration, but primarily and specially for our imitation."

In view of the hard times at home, says the Archbishop further on, the appeal would be withheld, but that Ireland's necessities are so pressing.

"For us to fail now in reaching out a strong helping hand to the sacred cause of Irish self-government and rightful liberty would be to throw up our arms on the eve of victory, to render useless the sacrifices and struggles of the past, to abandon poor Ireland to the want, misery, and suffering that have made her the mater dolorosa of the nations, and to condemn her to the shame of failure and the agony of despair."

HON. EDWARD BLAKE'S SPEECH IN AID OF HOME RULE FOR IRELAND.

AN immense audience presided over by the Hon. Nathan Matthews, Jr., Mayor of Boston, greeted the Hon. Edward Blake on his appearance at Boston Music Hall on the evening of January 31, 1894.

Seated on the platform and scattered through the audience were many of Boston's most distinguished citizens, whose marked attention and earnest enthusiasm was manifested during the entire discourse. Among those who met and congratulated Mr. Blake upon his appearance in Boston were Hon. Nathan Matthews, Jr., Mayor of Boston; Hon. A. W. Beard, United States Collector of Customs of the Port of Boston; Hon. Jonathan A. Lane, President Boston Merchants' Association; Judge Charles Levi Woodbury; Ex-Mayor Thomas N. Hart; Hon. Thomas J. Gargan; Chairman of State Committee I. N. F.; Hon. Alfred Hemenway; Hon. E. A. Pillsbury, Attorney General; Hon. Harvey N. Shepard; Hon. John Conness, Ex-United States Senator; Hon. Patrick Maguire, Editor of Republic; James Jeffrey Roche, Editor Pilot; Edward H. Clement, Editor Transcript; Chas. H. Taylor, Editor Globe; Stephen O'Meara, Editor Boston Journal; Eliot Lord, Editor Traveller; W. F. Murray, Esq., of Boston Herald; H. H. Fletcher, Esq., Manager Associated Press; Hon. W. W. Doherty, United States Marshal; Hon. Eneas Smythe; Hon. John R. Murphy; Hon. Henry F. Naphen; Wm. J. Burke; Christopher Blake; Dr. P. J. Timmins; Dr. Phillip P. Kelly; Col. Thomas F. Doherty; D. P. Sullivan; Dominick Toy; James B. Hand; T. B. Fitzpatrick; P. J. Flatley; Geo. Phillips; Wm. Andrews; Lawrence Reade; P. B. Magrain; Capt. P. S. Curry; James F. Roche, Esq., and many others.

The Boston Herald justly says of it: "Arguments of history, of expediency, of humanity, and even of practical politics, were marshaled one by one, in irresistible manner, to prove the pressing necessity for home rule, not only for Ireland, but all parts of the United Kingdom, and the frequent and prolonged bursts of enthusiasm

with which the gentleman's utterances were received proved beyond cavil that the great audience was entirely in agreement with his views.

"His speech was full of the fire which is so closely associated with the general ideas of Irish oratory, yet with it all there was a careful (almost a judicial) calmness of statement which was admirable throughout.

"He presented his arguments in a manner suggesting the great pleader engaged in a great case before the high court of last resort of modern times — the public opinion of the world."

The Hon. Thomas J. Gargan presented in a few well-chosen words His Honor Mayor Matthews as presiding officer of the evening.

SPEECH OF MAYOR MATTHEWS.

MAYOR MATTHEWS was given a very enthusiastic greeting as he rose in response to the pleasant introductory speech. He said:—

"LADIES AND GENTLEMEN: The people of this city are, as the size of this great audience bears witness, deeply and sincerely interested in the home rule movement, and they are in hearty sympathy with the efforts of the people of Ireland to secure once more the inestimable benefits to be derived from the exercise of self-government, denied to them for so many centuries.

We on this side of the ocean recognize in this movement an attempt to regulate the relations between Great Britain and Ireland according to the federal idea of government, which was first applied in a large and successful way to the political institutions of the United States of America.

We feel a certain pride of authorship in the federal system of government, and we are naturally desirous of seeing that system spread and its benefits extended to the people of other lands. Despised, derided, and derided at first by foreign statesmen, the experience of this country has proved its worth, and the present generation has witnessed the adoption of the federal idea in the great empire of Germany, in the Dominion of Canada, where our honored guest to-night took his first political lessons, —[applause]—and in other parts of the civilized world.

As we look dispassionately and without prejudice abroad, I think we cannot fail to agree that there is no country in the world more apt to realize benefit and profit from the adoption of the federal system than the Empire of Great Britain, a part of which already is constituted upon this basis, and another part of which — and that the part we are most concerned with to-night — is engaged in a determined, and I believe soon to be successful, struggle to realize the blessings of home rule. [Applause.]

Accustomed as we American citizens are to a systematic sub-division of the functions and powers of government, it is almost inconceivable to us that intelligent and conscientious men anywhere should object to giving home rule to Ireland. If there is any form of government that the ingenuity of man has yet devised that seems to us wholly unsuited to conduct safely and triumphantly the march of democratic progress, it is that in which all power, local as well as general, is centralized and concentrated in a single legislative body like the English Parliament, which has no real executive behind it to prevent by veto the enactment of hasty legislation, which is hampered by none of the checks and balances provided by a written constitution, and which is thus practically the sovereign arbiter of all the details of public business in every section, county, town, and city in the land. [Applause.]

We and all in this country, I think, favor home rule for ourselves and for the people of Ireland, for England and for Canada; and we are always ready to do honor to the men who have distinguished themselves in that cause.

But there is another reason, gentlemen, to which I beg to call your special attention, why we should be ready to do honor to that particular statesman who visits us to-night.

The methods by which the home rule movement has been promoted have been changed in recent years. Under the leadership of this gentleman and his colleagues that movement is being carried out now solely upon constitutional lines and by parliamentary methods.

The will of the majority [applause] in respect to party leadership and party tactics is recognized and obeyed, as it should be [applause]; and while the ultimate end, the restoration of self-government to the people of Ireland, is never lost sight of, these gentlemen believe it to be their patriotic duty to take also into account existing conditions, political contingencies and all considerations of a practical nature. [Applause.]

In other words, the agitation for home rule is now being carried on as a matter of practical politics in a practical, constitutional, democratic, American way. [Applause.] And let me tell you, my friends, speaking as an outsider, that is one reason why the people of this country are more generally in favor of home rule for Ireland now than formerly. [Applause.]

It seems to me that the Irish people have home rule within their grasp to-day. They have only to keep their courage up, to practise the patriotic virtue of patience, to act together, and to follow the wise counsels of their present leaders. [Applause.]

We met in this hall something over a year ago, to bid God-speed to our guest of this evening in his mission to assist in framing and in passing through the House of Commons, if he should be elected to that body, a practical and sufficient measure of home rule for Ireland.

We meet to-night to congratulate him upon his personal and party success in the House of Commons. [Applause.]

We meet to listen to such explanations, as he may find time and see fit to give us, of recent history of the home rule movement, and of the present policy of its leaders; and we meet to extend to him again, both in his own person (which we have learned to honor and respect) and on account of the cause he represents, the sympathy and support of the people of Boston. [Applause.]

I now have the great honor, ladies and gentlemen, to present to you Hon. Edward Blake, member of Parliament for Longford.

Mr. Blake on rising was greeted with great enthusiasm, and delivered the following

ADDRESS.

MR. MAYOR, LADIES AND GENTLEMEN — I must renew the expression of my heartfelt thanks for the very kind and complimentary invitation extended to me to revisit Boston, and to speak upon the present phase of the Home Rule question. When I addressed you more than a year ago, I endeavored to discuss the general principles which should obtain in the framing of a measure of Home Rule for Ireland, and entered at some length into the conditions of the past, the circumstances of the present, and the demands of the future; and I endeavored to state what, in my opinion, should be the aims and policy of Irish Nationalists. I am glad now to come before you, with the conviction that the forecast upon which I ventured has been substantially realized, and that the hopes of that day have advanced a long way towards their fulfilment. I shall, to-night, engage as little as may be in remote retrospect, or in historical recital of the lamentable past. It will be difficult enough to find time to deal with the great issues of the day.

Effective Conferences with Irish Parliamentary Party.

Shortly after I left you, those conferences, the expediency of which I had suggested, between certain members of the Irish Parliamentary party and one of the ministers mainly responsible for the Irish policy, began, and they continued for some months. In the result a great measure of constitutional freedom, not indeed in every minor detail exactly such as some of us might have wished, but the best practicable, and, after all, substantially satisfying the Irish demand, and unquestionably constituting an improvement in the bill of '86, was introduced into the House of Commons.

The Fight on the Bill.

The bulk of those opposed to us declared that the Liberals and Nationalists would never hold together; that the alliance would break up, and the bill so fail. There were those opposed to us who declared that, even did we hold together, yet the bill would never pass that House. And it soon became apparent that a struggle of unexampled severity and obstinacy was to take place. For many months the bill was fought even on the smallest and minutest details, and many hundreds of amendments were tabled, and many hundreds of speeches were delivered. It was known that much important and some absolutely essential business was also to come before Parliament; and it was hoped that the necessities of public

affairs would ensure the abandonment of the Home Rule measure. But, splendidly led by Mr. Gladstone, and ably officered by those under his command, the allied hosts of Liberals and Nationalists pressed forward in firm and unbroken array; and, though obliged in the end to overcome obstruction by means which were thought somewhat drastic, we carried our measure through the popular House. This was a great and even a decisive step; for no first class measure which has gone so far has in the end failed of being inscribed on the statute book.

Home Rule carried, but not yet Law.

But it has not yet become law. The House of Lords, after three days' debate, rejected by a majority of about 9 to 1 the measure on which the Commons had spent many months, and this partly on the ground of inadequate consideration there. That step was not unexpected, and it occasioned no dismay. But I understand that, not unnaturally, there exists in some quarters over here an apprehension that this attitude of the House of Lords may prove a permanent barrier to the consummation of Home Rule. Do not be afraid. It is absolutely impossible that an irresponsible and non-representative assembly, of whom the vast majority hold their legislative power from no higher title than this — that they are the sons of their fathers — can for any considerable time obstruct the will of the nation. Even when their power was much greater and that of the people much smaller they could not do so. Still less can they now. In the opinion of the great majority of Liberals and Radicals they have already stepped beyond their constitutional rights in declining to bow to the voice of the nation as expressed at the last general election.

Home Rule and the Lords.

But the wisest of themselves do not pretend that they will have any right to disregard that voice when it shall be raised again. Let me prove this statement by a single quotation. The Duke of Devonshire, who was subsequently chosen to move the rejection of the bill, used these words last summer: —

“The House of Lords know very well the limits of their power. All that the House of Lords can do in this question is to be the instrument by which the stronger forces will have full play and full effect. All that the House of Lords claims or will claim to do, is to enable the people of this country to express themselves a final judgment upon this bill when it has assumed a complete shape and not the vague and indefinite form in which this policy has hitherto been veiled.”

Depend upon it, gentlemen, that the issue of Home Rule will be determined by the verdict of the people at a general election, and that a verdict favorable to our cause will be turned into a law. The Lords know this well; and therefore we have to fight them in the desperate effort they are making to carry the next election.

But you may ask: Why is not the bill to be introduced again

in this Parliament and before an election? It is not to be introduced again because we know that the House of Lords would reject it again in this Parliament on the ground just mentioned, and that the time spent in its rediscussion in the Commons would be time worse than wasted.

Why the Bill will not come up again in Parliament before Election.

It is quite true that the Tories and Liberal-Unionists hoped and believed that we Nationalists would insist upon this re-introduction. Their desire was that the Government should be forced by us to discuss nothing but Home Rule. They believed that our necessities, political and pecuniary, would constrain us to demand this course, and they rightly thought that from it they would derive much political gain. Listen to what Lord Randolph Churchill, one of their active leaders, said last summer:—

“The Opposition is a large Opposition. It is the largest since the days when the party of Pitt overcame that of Fox. The Opposition is a powerful one and has resolved to give Gladstone no quarter, no breathing time, not a moment in which he can design matters so as to play his tricks off on the House of Commons. What next will happen? The Home Rule Bill will be thrown out by the House of Lords by an enormous majority, and Mr. Gladstone will have all his wicked work to do over again. We have heard his boast and his threat that he will carry his bill through an autumn session. We take no account of this threat. The forces which are gathered together against him are absolutely irrepressible. They are not only the forces of men, they are the forces of time. To save the Union there is nothing in legitimate action to which the Opposition will not resort. He may have an autumn session if he likes. Nobody cares whether he has an autumn session or whether he has not. There are only eight or ten weeks in which that distinguished man can accomplish anything, and we'll take care that he accomplishes nothing. He must re-introduce his Home Rule Bill next year, if he does not re-introduce it this year. I will tell you why. The Irish party will compel him to do so. The fact of the matter is the strain upon their pecuniary resources, the tremendous strain on their private business in Ireland, the strain on their physical strength and mental energy and patience will be too great. They will compel Mr. Gladstone to do their will, as they have done before. Mr. Gladstone is absolutely in the power and under the control of Mr. Sexton. He will be driven like any galley slave and will be compelled to place his Home Rule Bill before the House of Commons again. The House of Lords will throw out his bill again by a majority equal or greater than their former majority, and, in the face of dissolution, political ruin will await him. Now, we of the Opposition are determined to force the question, to keep a clear issue before the country. He shall not cheat and deceive the country as he did at the last election. The issue between the parties shall be Union or Separation, and nothing else.”

Well, it is quite true that the strain upon the Irish members has been, is, and will be of the very severest character; and that the strain upon the patience of the Irish people has been, is, and will be great. But it is not at this crisis of our fate that either the Irish members or the Irish people, within or beyond the shores of Ireland, are going to prove unequal to their high duty. You and we are, I believe, determined to stand that strain.

And you have already seen Lord Randolph Churchill's boasts belied by events, and great progress made by our allies in several of their large measures, though obstruction threatened sometimes to prevail.

Reasons against Immediate Dissolution of Parliament. .

But you may say: If it is useless to introduce the Home Rule bill in this Parliament, why not dissolve at once? Well, gentlemen, there is an old proverb that "It is useful to learn from the enemy." What the enemy want is an immediate dissolution. I do not think that it is a very good reason why we should give it. They want it because they think it will be to their advantage, and I agree with them. Therefore I am indisposed to give it. Why would it be to their advantage? For this obvious reason: At the last election the Liberals and Radicals, true to their pledges made nearly eight years ago, made Home Rule the very front plank in their platform, and they have kept it there ever since. If Home Rule is not law, it is not their fault. But they did not make it the only plank in their platform. They added important, popular, and democratic proposals which are pressing for solution. They have obtained a majority. They have kept their pledges to Irish Nationalists so far, and they intend to keep them to the end; and they invite Irish Nationalists to enable them to use the majority so obtained to press forward, during this year, those other Liberal and Radical and Democratic measures which they promised the people in case they obtained power. If we refused; if we declined to reciprocate sacrifice for sacrifice, to give help for help; if we showed ourselves unconcerned for the interests and wishes of the allies upon whose good-will and strength we depend for our ultimate success, what right would we have to expect to triumph? But with even still greater force I may ask, if we sent the Government back to the polls without having made even an effort to carry through the House of Commons the measures which they promised, what right would we have to expect a majority next time?

The Objects of Some Delay.

It is not to an American audience, versed in popular elections and the play of parties, that I need enlarge upon this topic. You all apprehend the situation. The truth is that with that prescience which distinguished him, as long ago as 1881, more than five years before the formation of the happy alliance between the Irish Nationalists and the Liberals, Charles Stewart Parnell pointed out one road to victory, when he used, in a letter to the Irish National League, these words:—

"The second and only other alternative appeared to be that we should steadfastly labor on, deepening the lines and widening the area of our agitation, appealing to the masses of the population of England and Scotland, who are much less represented in the House of Commons than are the masses of Ireland; appealing, I say, against territorialism and shop-ocracy, which

dominate Parliament, to the workingmen and farm laborers of Britain, who clearly have no interest in the mis-government and persecution in Ireland. . . . The second alternative presents to us many elements of solid and ultimate success. As I have said, Parliament is at present governed by the landlords, manufacturers, and shopkeepers of Great Britain. At election times the springs are set in motion by the wire-pullers of the two political parties, and the mass of the electors are driven to the polling booths to register the decree of some caucus, with place and power, and not the good of the people, as its object. Public opinion in England is also deliberately and systematically perverted with regard to Ireland, but a vigorous agitation in England and Scotland would change all this. The glad approach of household suffrage, a practical certainty before the next general election, will sound the doom of the English land system, while the starting of the workingmen's or agricultural laborer candidate in every British constituency would soon bring House of Commons radicalism to its senses. The juncture between the English democracy and Irish nationalism upon the basis of the restoration to Ireland of the right to make Irish laws, the overthrow of territorialism in both countries, and the enfranchisement of labor from crushing taxes for the maintenance of standing armies and navies, would prove irresistible, would terminate the strife of centuries, and secure lasting friendship, based on mutual interest and confidence between the two nations."

The Fruit of Parnell's Labors.

The suffrage has been widened as Mr. Parnell predicted. The masses of the population in Britain have obtained a much greater share of electoral power. Those masses have been to a great degree enlightened upon the Irish question. But more, much more than Mr. Parnell hoped, he accomplished. He made an alliance not only with the Radicals but with the Liberals, and a combined organization, far more powerful than he indicated, was achieved when he came to terms of honorable settlement with Mr. Gladstone. The cause has advanced far faster than it could otherwise have moved, and we must observe in the future the conditions of our successes in the past. My quotation shows you that Parnell contemplated an alliance based on the redress of popular grievances in Britain as well as in Ireland.

The alliance between the British and Irish democracies has shown itself in the House of Commons, where even during the discussions on this very Home Rule bill, when we were once or twice constrained, as a protest against some well-meant but ill-judged concessions, to vote in opposition to some amendments of the Government, we Irish Nationalists found ourselves backed by the flower of the English Radical party in numbers even greater than our own. With the British democracy we never had, at any rate we have not now, any quarrel. Its mind being informed, its heart being moved, its conscience being touched, it has conceded the justice of our claims, and is determined to sustain them. And we, on the other hand, looking to the claims of natural equity, to the claims of friendship, to the character and the directly beneficial results to ourselves of the reforms proposed in the interest of the British democracy, must heartily second the efforts to pass them into law. Thus

shall we, instead of weakening or breaking, solidify and cement the alliance upon which we rely, and strengthen the forces by whose aid we are to win. What is the nature of these reforms? Broadly speaking, they divide themselves into two classes; one, connected with the making of the legislature, a matter in which Ireland is deeply concerned—for example, an improved register under which the masses may have in reality the opportunity of voting; equality in the political rights of all capable citizens by the limitation of one vote to one man; simultaneous polling throughout the kingdom; the payment by the public of the public expenses of election, now largely borne by the candidates, and so conferring an advantage on the rich and inflicting a disability upon the poor; the payment of indemnity to members, thus rendering it possible for workingmen to send those of their own class to represent their views; the shortening of Parliaments, so as to give more frequent opportunities to the people to express their will by the choice of representatives; and if need be, as I dare say need there may be, some reform which shall limit the power of obstruction of the House of Lords. What American is there, what Irishman is there, who does not sympathize with such a programme, who does not see that these are steps, each one of which helps on the cause of popular government and gives Home Rule a better chance at the next election? Then as to measures of specific reform. I do not go over the roll including several labor measures directly affecting Ireland; but I point out to you that many of them embrace and emphasize the sacred principle of Home Rule. The Parish Councils Bill, now being fought, gives Home Rule to the village; the proposed disestablishment of the churches in Wales and Scotland is based expressly upon the recognition of the right of each of these great divisions of Britain to a competent voice in determining the character of its own institutions in a word, upon the principle of Home Rule. And so I might go on.

Do you suppose that a campaign of this description can be otherwise than most valuable and important in widening and deepening the convictions of the British public in favor of Home Rule for Ireland? Do you think if we were to thwart the British democracy in their effort to attain these reforms, we should have, or even deserve, their help in bringing about Home Rule for Ireland? No. Home Rule is to be settled at the polls; and we are doing what we can to get strength at those polls. We are determined then, on all grounds, to give an earnest helping hand to the British democracy which has come to our relief, and, so far as in us lies, to secure to them for this year, progress in the popular measures which they have at heart, knowing that, in so doing, we shall more effectively than by any other means advance the cause which we have most at heart—the passing of the Home Rule Bill.

But what is this Home Rule Bill?

The Present Home Rule Bill.

Let me bring once more before you as briefly as I can the leading principles and features of that great measure as it is now presented, so that you may judge whether we are right in our acceptance. It is based upon the principle that for a certain limited number of large objects there is rational ground for a union between Great Britain and Ireland. That proposition has been affirmed by a long line of the most distinguished Irish patriots who have led in the popular cause; and it is now proposed to consecrate such a limited and rational union by the free consent of both peoples.

Basis of a Free, Limited, and Rational Union.

For what purposes then are the two kingdoms to remain united, working under one head and one Parliament? For objects connected with the Crown and its succession; for relations with foreign powers; for purposes of offence and defence, including military and naval armaments; for questions of colonial and other dependencies; for subjects of common and external trade, including duties of customs and excise; for taxation necessary to carry out these common objects; and for certain other analogous but minor matters. You in the States, as we in Canada, can understand a union for purposes like these; and you as well as we know that such a union may be highly beneficial to all parties, and is entirely compatible with Home Rule, as existent in your country in the different States, and in ours in the different Provinces.

The bill proposes that the common concerns should be managed in a common Parliament; and in that common Parliament Ireland is to be, as she ought to be, represented in proportion to her numbers. A question arises with regard to which I shall not trouble you in detail, as to the voting powers of that representation. Enough to say that Ireland claims no more than she should have — the right to speak and vote in matters in which she is concerned, and does not herself ask for any power to interfere in purely British concerns.

The Irish Legislature.

So much for the Union. But what of our great question, Home Rule? This — that an Irish Legislature is to be established, and an Irish executive set up, responsible to that Legislature; that this Irish Legislature is to have control over all exclusively Irish affairs, including the land, education, police, judiciary, the administration of justice, property and civil rights, municipal institutions, local development, the thousand things which affect the daily life of the people. Not merely is Ireland to make her own laws on these vital subjects, but she is also to administer those laws.

Postponements.

It is said, indeed, that there are restrictions and postponements. There are. As to the postponements I regard them lightly. They

are not unimportant ; but no sensible man would seriously suggest throwing away the bill which gives so much at once, only because it delays for a brief space the actual fruition of some part, which fruition, however, it secures in the near future. For example, the land question cannot be dealt with by the Irish Legislature for three years. The transformation of the police is to occupy six years ; and so on. I will only say that, though there are some difficulties, there are also some compensations connected with these provisions.

Restrictions.

What of the permanent restrictions ? The main subjects are in principle unobjectionable. It is provided that no law shall be made for the establishment or endowment of any religion, and that no man shall be by law prejudiced or preferred in consequence of religion ; that every child shall be entitled to attend any school for which public money is paid, without attending the religious instruction at such school ; and that no man shall be deprived of his property without just compensation, and so on. You here are familiar with such restrictions. They are, in truth, only the record of what are regarded on this continent as fundamental principles of real freedom ; for real freedom does not involve the power of a majority to injure or oppress a minority, or to take away its rights. And we here, on both sides of the line, believe that religion is a concern between man and his Maker, and that the less the State has to do with the Church, the better for Church and State alike.

Other Securities.

Provisions there are, in accordance with the forms of the British Constitution, not to be overcome without a revolution, under which, in case a violation of the spirit of the Irish Constitution is attempted, the Imperial Executive, under its responsibility to the Imperial Parliament, can instruct the Viceroy not to give his assent to such a bill. This is a security to the fancies and fears and frenzies of the minority ; and the Irish people do not object to it any more than did Mr. Parnell, who expressly agreed to it. We do not object, because our intention is to observe in good faith the spirit and principle of our great charter, and we know that while we pursue that course the sword will remain undrawn. So, again, the Imperial Parliament retains that of which indeed it cannot divest itself, its power to pass laws about Ireland ; but that power once again, it is fully understood, is to be exercised only in case the spirit and principles of the charter are grossly violated.

In all great constitutional compacts, it is the essence and spirit which is vital. It is the purpose and object of the great communities concerned which will regulate the working of the plan. And since the main purpose and objects of this bill is to allow the Irish to govern themselves, we rest tranquil and content in the

belief that once the bill becomes law, that result will follow. And all our colonial experiences prove the truth of this view.

Questions of Finance.

One word as to finance. We insisted that the financial scheme was unjust to Ireland, in that it called for too great an Imperial contribution, having regard to her tax-paying power. A reasonable adjustment has been made. For the comparatively short period of six years the share of Ireland towards Imperial purposes is to be based upon the amount of her present net contribution, as ascertained on the average for the preceding three years, subject, however, to a reduction in respect of a proportion of the extra cost of the constabulary during the period of transformation. The Tories say we are to pay ten millions of dollars a year too little. We say we are to pay too much. How is the question to be settled? A commission is to be appointed within a few months to investigate the whole subject of the financial relations between the two countries, the old adjustments included, to inquire into their relative tax-paying capacity, to take all evidence, obtain all the information, elicit all the opinions which can be had, and to report to Parliament. The whole question being thus threshed out, the more permanent adjustment is to be made between the two countries during the six-year term, to take effect at its close; and this seems an equitable plan.

A Charter of Liberty.

It is for this great constitutional settlement, which will, when consummated, once again give us the control of our own affairs, that we are struggling; and I ask you if I have not sketched out a charter of liberty deserving of grateful acceptance by the Irish people? This is certain, that it is a charter better and fuller than that which in 1886, under Mr. Parnell's lead, the Irish people did accept, and from that acceptance they have no intention of receding.

The Land Question.

If there were time I would like to enter upon some of the many pressing Irish questions, which, with ever increasing weight and volume, call for solution, but which are necessarily, as far as possible, to be postponed or dealt with perfunctorily, pending the settlement of the great subject which includes them all. I discussed with you last year, to some extent, the subject of the land, which, although in some aspects largely solved, is in other aspects becoming each year more urgent still. The principle of compulsory sale, which I told you I thought essential, is rapidly advancing in estimation; an inquiry is to be made into the working of the lands acts which we claim have not been administered in their true spirit; some legislation on the subject of the evicted tenants is to be proposed in a few weeks; and sooner or later drastic steps must take place for the relief of the con-

gested districts, the position of which is admitted even by Mr. T. W. Russell to be appalling; the time for the revision of the judicial rents draws nigh, and our future largely depends on that revision being made in an equitable spirit.

I also last year adverted to that bureaucratic, anti-popular, and centralized system of government and administration which prevails in Ireland, known as the Castle System.

Rural Government, the Catholic Majority, the Protestant Minority.

Neither on the Land nor on the Castle system will I say a word more to-night; but I wish to point out that, even in those matters in which there is now nominal control in the Irish counties over rural affairs, it is not a popular control, but an ascendancy of the Protestant and landlord minority over the Roman Catholic and Nationalist majority which obtains. I doubt that many Americans, I doubt that many even Irish-Americans, long out here, are fully alive to the shameful facts; and it is well that you should learn them.

Examples.

I take as example five counties whose cases were brought up in the House of Commons last session. The keystone of county government is the grand jury, which is nominated yearly by the sheriff, which sheriff is, in practice, suggested by the grand jury to the judges, and by them recommended to the Viceroy. This grand jury, thus in effect largely self-elected, amongst other functions, appoints most of the county officers, and distributes the local taxes or county cess, amounting, in more than one of the cases which I shall cite, to over \$200,000 a year.

Now take the County of Donegal. Its population is 185,000, of whom 142,000 are Roman Catholics, almost entirely Nationalists, and 42,000 Protestants, mainly Unionists. The grand jury are, every man of them, Protestant and Unionist, mostly landlords and landlords' agents. Of the sixteen cess collectors, who are appointed by the justices, thirteen are Protestants and Unionists. The two county surveyors, with salaries of \$2,000 and \$2,500 a year, the secretary of the grand jury, the solicitor to the grand jury, the clerk of the crown, the sub-sheriff, are all Protestants and Unionists. Poor Law Guardians are elected on a four-pound franchise, with a cumulative vote, under which the landlords are able to overbear the Catholics and Home Rulers, who are thus placed in a minority in five of eight boards, of which the vast majority are Protestants and Unionists. In Donegal Union, for example, five only, out of twenty elected guardians, are Catholics and Home Rulers; and the officers, namely, the clerk, the master, the matron, the nurse, the teacher, the relieving officer, the porter, the doctor, and the dispensary doctors, are all Protestants and Unionists. Of the Poor Law collectors, three are Protestants and Unionists. The county court judge, the clerk of the peace, the crown solicitor, the registrar, the

resident magistrate, are all Protestants and Unionists. Of the justices of the peace, 140 are Protestants, and only thirty Catholics, and of these some have only been lately named under the existing Liberal Government.

Thus you see the whole County Government is monopolized by the small minority. And yet in this county, amongst the members is one Protestant Home Ruler, elected of course by the Catholic Nationalist majority. Now take the County of Waterford, with a population of 97,000, of whom 92,000 are Catholics and 5,000 are Protestants. Twenty-one of the grand jury are Protestants and Unionists, two are Catholics and Unionists. There is not a single Home Ruler. Nearly all the officials are, as in Donegal, Protestants and Unionists. But the member in the last Parliament was, and in the present Parliament is, a Protestant Home Ruler. Take the County of Tipperary, with a population of 173,000, of whom 162,000 are Catholics, and 11,000 Protestants. The position of the grand jury and of almost all the officers is the same. For example, look at the Clonmel Asylum, the twenty-one governors of which are composed of sixteen Protestant and three Catholic Unionists and only two Catholic Home Rulers; while of the inmates, as you would expect from the relative numbers of the same population, 600 are Catholic and 30 are Protestant.

In the County Kerry, with a population of 173,000 Catholics and 6,000 Protestants, and the County Sligo, with a population of 89,000 Catholics and 9,000 Protestants, the results are about the same. As a general result, summing up the grand juries in these five counties with a population of 660,000 Catholics and 73,000 Protestants, there are two Catholic grand jurors and 114 Protestants.

I might continue this examination at great length and in other departments, but I think I have shown you enough to prove there exists still an ascendancy which ought to be put down, and that the minority in truth rules the majority in Ireland to-day. It is for the continuance of that rule that they are struggling.

Holding to Basic Principles of Irish Party.

Now, gentlemen, let me say a word as to the principles upon which we have carried on and are carrying on our struggle, and your approbation of which we confidently expect.

Unity.

We hold fast by that fundamental principle on which the Irish Parliamentary party was formed under Mr. Parnell, by the maintenance of which it has so far succeeded, and through which alone it can hope to win, the principle of absolute unity. Within the party, differences of opinion must be expected; men's minds will vary. These differences must be thoroughly threshed out amongst ourselves. The utmost freedom of discussion within our councils

must exist. But a decision must, in the end, be taken; and by that decision all who remain members of the Irish Parliamentary party must abide. Thus acting as a unit, marching and voting as one man, thus, and thus alone, can we exercise the force and power essential to success.

Alliance.

Next, we intend to maintain, just so long as the Liberal and Radical party is faithful to its pledges to the Irish National party, the alliance which Mr. Parnell formed between those two parties for the purposes, and on the general alliance on which he formed it, as applied to the conditions of to-day. That alliance has wrought great things. And it will, we believe, achieve our final triumph.

Independence.

Next, we intend to maintain as sacred the principle which Mr. Parnell also laid down, of the absolute independence of the Irish party. We are allies of the British Liberals, but we are not British Liberals. We are Irish Nationalists, and Irish Nationalists only. We act in coöperation with the party, but do not identify ourselves with it as members of the same party. The grounds and reasons of our concerted action are open and public, and the character of our alliance is known to all men. We have, of course, a large voice in controlling the legislative policy to be pursued towards Ireland.

Nationalists hold the Key of the Position.

We hold the key of the position, but we hold it for the good of our country; and our vision is unclouded, our action is unhampered by any personal connection, any official connection, any pecuniary connection, any titular connection, with the party in power. We have responsibilities; but we take no offices; we receive no emoluments; we accept no honors. We are the ministers of the people, not the ministers of the Imperial Crown. The situation is abnormal; it has its disadvantages. In some respects good might be done, and mistakes might be avoided were other conditions practicable. But the advantages to the Irish cause enormously overbear those inconveniences; and we hold fast by the principle that the Irish Nationalist party, till the cause of Ireland be won, must remain absolutely independent, and devoted only to the service of the Irish people.

Service of Irish Members.

That service is not a light one. Its duties and responsibilities are great and exacting at any time; they have been extraordinarily heavy lately; and they will so continue till the close of the struggle. Almost our whole time and efforts and energies are devoted to the public cause; and you will have observed, from the quotation I gave from Lord Randolph Churchill, his not unjust estimate of the strain, the exhausting strain upon us, and his cynical calculation that we would bend to that strain.

Encouragements.

What supports, what encourages, what enables us to go forward? First and mainly, of course, the conviction that we are in the right path, in the path of duty, and the belief that the pursuit of that path will eventuate in triumph for our country. But we are supported also by the reflection that the Irish people, within and without the limits of Ireland, have in a wonderful way exhibited their political sagacity, their temper, their patience, their moderation, their firmness, and their resolution, in recognizing the condition and approving the policy I have endeavored to set before you, and that they have stood, stand now, and intend to stand solidly, at our back.

The Irish Cause Outside of Ireland.

The Irish cause has been largely dependent upon the sympathy of the liberty-loving peoples of the world, and it largely depends on that sympathy to-day. But it has depended in a still more special and absolute sense, not merely upon the sympathy, but upon the devotion, the affection, the undying attachment which binds to the sacred cause the hearts of all Irishmen all the world over. And nothing proves more clearly our clear title to that measure of self-government we claim, than the continued existence of that deep attachment and determined effort on the part of those who can claim to belong to the Irish race, wherever their lot may be cast, or in whatever land they may have been born.

Old Remittances.

In days gone by the Irish abroad sent millions upon millions of their hard earnings back to Ireland, and their conduct was applauded by everybody, landlords and all. They found, after long and bitter experience, that they were but contributing to the payment of exorbitant and unjust rents and rendering possible the continuance of an iniquitous system. In these later years they have done much to put an end to that iniquitous system and to restore the liberties of their country, by contributing thousands, instead of hundreds of thousands as before; but in another way—in aid of the national movement.

Publicity of Accounts and Estimates.

The present Parliamentary party thought it right, more than a year ago, to publish an audit, by sworn chartered accountants, of its financial transactions; and it has repeated within a few weeks that operation; so that all the world, friend and foe, knows what we have received, from what quarters we have received it, and how it has been applied. I thought it a natural sequel to that course to make public, as I did a few weeks ago, my estimate of our requirements for this year, and all the world now knows that, too.

The Needs of the Irish Party.

We need in all a sum of about \$240,000, of which \$45,000 is

required for the payment of allowances to members. You here understand that question. The wise men who framed the Constitution of the Republic prescribed that members should receive wages. The Irish party makes no pretence to be a wealthy party. You know who has the wealth of Ireland, and how and why the masses of the people have remained poor. One-half of us are so circumstanced that we can, and of course we do, maintain ourselves by our own exertions while we sit in Parliament; but there are some on whom is imposed a much heavier sacrifice than that which falls upon us, because they are called upon to give up to their country the golden years of life and their opportunities for making an independence. These receive and must receive from the Irish nation the bare means of subsistence, for it is no more, while they are discharging their duty to Ireland. It was only last session that the imputation was laid upon us that we were in the pay of the wealthy Gladstonians. That imputation was resented and denied, and its author apologized in Parliament to the party he had insulted.

We do not choose to be placed in any such relation to the Liberal party; we choose to meet them on terms of absolute and perfect independence and equality. It would be a humiliation to accept their money, even tendered, as no doubt it would be tendered, in an honorable and respectful spirit. But it is no humiliation to Irishmen, fighting the Irish battle, to owe some part of the means of carrying on that contest to fellow-Irishmen; and it is to our fellow-Irishmen we make our appeal. We require \$45,000 towards the expense of the general election. You may be surprised to know that in the old country the public charges connected with an election, for example, for hustings, polling booths, returning officers, clerks, advertisements, and so forth, are borne not by the public, but by the candidates, and thus an enormous tax is placed upon the popular party. In order to diminish our resources, seats absolutely hopeless are contested by the landlords, who have made up a great fund. For example, take the two divisions of Longford, for which Mr. McCarthy and I sit. Our elections were contested, though it was perfectly well known we would, as we did, poll about ten votes to one of our opponents; and thus a fine of between two and three thousand dollars was inflicted on us.

There are expenses for the registration of voters, largely conducted at the cost of those interested in the political movement, for which we estimate a contribution of \$10,000. There are expenses connected with the British propaganda, by pamphlet, leaflet, public meeting, speaking, canvassing, and so forth, through which enormous results were achieved between 1886 and 1890, but which we have been obliged almost to abandon for want of money; which we desire to resume with a view to the next election; and for which we estimate \$20,000. And I may say to you that our adversaries, whose funds are practically unlimited, are using these methods with

tremendous energy and, of course, with some degree of success. Are we to meet them; or are we to let them take and keep the field without opposition? There is the cost of maintaining the evicted tenants during this year, in the course of which we are promised some legislative relief. Their cause is a sacred one; Irishmen cannot abandon them; and Ireland herself is undertaking this part of the movement. The reduced estimate on this head is \$85,000. Lastly, there is a debt of a little over \$30,000 in part remaining due since the period of the split and in part the balance of an advance given on the occasion of the last election, but for which we should have found ourselves unable to return members even for counties in which there is an overwhelming Nationalist majority. This debt was due to the cessation of subscriptions for a time after the split, and it must somehow be made good.

Other Expenses of the Home Rule Movement.

Now you must not suppose these are all the expenses of the movement. These are the sums required by the central organization to supplement the large local and individual contributions and expenditures made throughout Ireland. Nor are you to suppose that Ireland herself does nothing. On the contrary, considering her poverty, she does much. Besides these large local and individual contributions, the amount of which I cannot reckon, but which I know to be heavy, out of the total of \$172,500 which came to the party last year, Ireland contributed over \$99,000, while the Irish abroad contributed \$73,000. In several quarters in the States, notably in this State of Massachusetts, and also in some other parts, liberal contributions were made, but the aggregate contributed from the States was \$43,000 only. Now, how do you stand compared with my own country of Canada? You boast yourselves to be about 12,000,000 of Irish-American Nationalist sympathizers, while we have in Canada, I suppose, not many more than 300,000. You are nearly forty fold our numbers. Having enjoyed longer and wider opportunities of accumulation, you have perhaps fifty or sixty fold our wealth.

Did the States contribute fifty or sixty times what Canada did last year? Did they contribute ten times? No; they contributed about four times only. Canada gave \$11,200; and this year she has already given much, and I believe she will give in all \$15,000. May we not hope that 12,000,000 here will give \$150,000 when they see plainly set before them the reasons and object of the request? I know that this is not a time for collections in this country. I deplore for your sakes, even more than for our own, the sad circumstances which render it unfitting to propose immediate collections here; and you may be sure that it is with no desire to press upon the masses of our fellow-countrymen at this unfavorable moment, that I make this plain statement now. I do so because it is the last oppor-

tunity which is open to me before returning to the struggle, and because I feel that such a statement as I have made would with me, and therefore I think it will with you, afford a basis for action when the proper time arrives, and for organization meanwhile. I hope, too, that here, as in Canada, some of the wealthy Irishmen may act more early.

Gentlemen, the burden proposed is light. It is in truth infinitesimal if spread over the proper area. And to that end organization — organization which shall draw out the sympathies and enlist the support of the masses — is the one essential thing. I have therefore to ask you in Massachusetts, who are foremost in that work of organization, who have realized more, I believe, than any other State its importance and proved its efficiency, to still further extend your organization. And I have to ask other States to imitate Massachusetts and to enroll themselves in the National Federation of America, to which we owe so much. So doing, and acting upon the proverb that many hands make light work, the Irishmen of America will find no difficulty in performing their part in the restoration of the liberties of Ireland. And it will be for those of this favored generation a source of pride and pleasure in the days to come, when the struggle shall be over, when the result shall have been attained, when the great act of justice and of reconciliation shall have been accomplished, to be able to say that they stood steadfast to the cause; that they did not lose hope or courage, but persisted to the end; and that their resolution, determination, and self-sacrifice materially contributed to such a noble issue.

IRISH PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE.

JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P., Chairman.

Hon. EDWARD BLAKE, M. P.

MICHAEL DAVITT.

JOHN DILLON, M. P.

T. M. HEALY, M. P.

WILLIAM O'BRIEN, M. P.

ARTHUR O'CONNOR, M. P.

T. P. O'CONNOR, M. P.

THOMAS SEXTON, M. P.

NATIONAL TRUSTEES :

JUSTIN McCARTHY, M. P.

JOHN DILLON, M. P.

THOMAS SEXTON, M. P.

Accounts and Audits of the following four Funds as
Published in the "Freeman's Journal and
National Press" on 9th and
11th December, 1893.

IRISH PARLIAMENTARY FUND.

ACCOUNT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

FROM 13th AUGUST, 1892, TO 31st OCTOBER, 1892.

RECEIPTS.

To Amount transferred from Irish National Federation Election Fund (General Election, 1892)	£6,072 10 11
“ Balance of Special Fund Account	700 0 0
	<hr/> £6,772 10 11

PAYMENTS.

By Treasurers of Parliamentary Party (J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., John Barry, M. P., and Alfred Webb, M. P.)	£2,050 0 0
“ Evicted Tenants Committee (J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., and D. Sheehy, M. P.)*	3,500 0 0
“ Grants to Members	100 0 0
“ Speakers in England (expenses of), per B. C. Molloy, M. P.	100 0 0
“ Cheque Book	0 8 4
“ Balance to next account	1,022 2 7
	<hr/> £6,772 10 11

We have examined the foregoing Account, with the Books and Vouchers of the above Fund, and certify the same to be correct.

KEVANS AND SON,

8th December, 1893.

Chartered Accountants, 22 Dame street, Dublin.

FROM 31st OCTOBER, 1892, TO 31st OCTOBER, 1893.

1892.

RECEIPTS.

Oct. 31 — To Balance from previous Account	£1,022 2 7
Date of Publication.	SUBSCRIPTIONS — AMERICA.
April 20 — Irish National Federation of America, per Eugene Kelly	£2,000 0 0
May 11 — Ancient Order of Hibernians, Philadelphia	10 0 0
“ 13 — Irish National Federation of America, per Eugene Kelly	800 0 0
June 6 — An American sympathizer, per Justin M'Carthy, M. P.	20 0 0
“ 6 — Irish National Federation of America per Eugene Kelly	1,000 0 0
“ 6 — Fall River, Massachusetts, per Rev. M. M'Cabe	20 0 0
“ 6 — St. Paul, Minnesota, per Thos. Grace, &c.	324 12 0
“ 28 — Irish National Federation of America, per Eugene Kelly	1,000 0 0
July 13 — Irish National Federation of America, per Eugene Kelly	1,000 0 0
“ 20 — Ancient Order of Hibernians, Minnesota, per J. C. Hessian	92 7 0
“ 20 — St. Patrick's, Minnesota, per James Dillon, &c.	10 0 0
“ 24 — Irish National Federation of America, per Eugene Kelly	1,000 0 0
“ 28 — Buffalo, N. Y., per Rev. P. Cronin	1,021 8 0
Aug. 1 — Ancient Order of Hibernians, Atlantic City, per B. Conway	21 10 0
“ 30 — W. J. Hynes, per James Sullivan, Chicago	10 0 0
	<hr/> 8,329 17 0

* This sum of £3,500 is a refund to the Evicted Tenants Funds on account of £4,050 taken from the National Fund during 1892, for the use of the Parliamentary Party, and is included in the sum of £18,450 debited to the Evicted Tenants Committee in the audited account of the National Fund to October, 1892.

SUBSCRIPTIONS—CANADA*.

Nov. 15	— Toronto (Irish Home Rule Executive Committee), per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	£1,000	0	0
1893.				
Mar. 2	— Montreal, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	100	0	0
May 13	— Toronto (Irish Home Rule Executive Committee), per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	150	0	0
June 6	— Toronto, from a few friends, per C. B. Higgins	2	5	2
“ 6	— St. Catherine's, Ontario, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	24	6	1
“ 6	— Guelph, Ontario, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	58	9	7
“ 6	— Quebec, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	167	6	8
“ 17	— Ancient Order of Hibernians, Hamilton, Ontario, per M. Malone	5	1	11
July 31	— Montreal, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	210	0	0
		£1,717 9 5		

AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND, AND OTHER PLACES
ABROAD.

1892.				
Nov. 3	— Victoria Irish National Federation, per N. M. O'Donnell	£300	0	0
“ 18	— “Melbourne Advocate” Fund, per J. Winter	241	19	11
1893.				
Jan. 12	— J. Daly, New Caledonia	5	0	0
Feb. 13	— Wellington, New Zealand, Irish National Federation, per J. P. M'Allister	14	10	0
June 28	— C. P. Collins, Sydney	0	10	0
July 24	— J. C. Brown, Surinam, Dutch Guiana, per J. R. Cox	10	0	0
Aug. 1	— Sydney Irish National Federation, per F. B. Freehill, &c.	500	0	0
Sept. 19	— Hastings, New Zealand, per P. M'Mahon, etc.	76	7	6
“ 19	— Thomas M'Elroy, Shanghai, China	5	0	0
“ 20	— Dalysford, Victoria, per Rev. T. S. Collins	34	4	5
		1,187 11 10		

SUBSCRIPTIONS, IRELAND AND INDIVIDUAL
SUBSCRIPTIONS.

1892.				
Dec. 1	— J. Shields, Kilsyth, Scotland	£4	0	0
“ 5	— Swords, Co. Dublin, per Rev. J. J. Dunphy, C. C.	8	0	0
1893.				
Jan. 12	— Major J. E. Jameson, London	100	0	0
“ 26	— Sologhead, Co. Tipperary, per Rev. T. O'Dwyer, P. P.	10	0	0
“ 26	— A Friend, per John Dillon, M. P.	20	0	0
April 3	— William Baillie, Belfast	5	0	0
June 28	— An Irish Sympathizer, per Justin M'Carthy, M. P.	50	0	0
Aug. 30	— A Sympathizer, per Sir T. H. Grattan Esmonde, M. P.	50	0	0
	Sundry Smaller Subscriptions	10	0	0
		257 0 0		
		To Election Expenses refunded		
		35 0 0		
		To Interest		
		2 5 6		
		£12,551 6 4		

* NOTE.— In addition to the subscriptions from Canada, a sum of £539 16s 1d, which was received from Canada for this Fund, was acknowledged in and lodged to the credit of the Home Rule Fund, in audit of which it will be found.

1892.

PAYMENTS.

Nov. 17 —	By Treasurers of Parliamentary Party, J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., John Barry, M. P., and Alfred Webb, M. P.	£1,000 0 0	
1893.			
Jan. 26 —	Do do	1,000 0 0	
April 19 —	Do do	1,775 0 0	
“ 19 —	Do do	500 0 0	
June 23 —	Do do	2,400 0 0	
Sept. 5 —	Do do	2,400 0 0	
			£9,075 0 0
Sept. 5 —	Evicted Tenants Committee, J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., and D. Sheehy, M. P.	1,500 0 0	
“ 15 —	Do do	300 0 0	
			1,800 0 0
July 28 —	T. Curran, M. P., — Repayment on account of Loan	500 0 0	
Sept. 8 —	Do do	250 0 0	
			750 0 0
1892.			
Nov. 17 —	Dr. Fox, M. P., for Expenses of Mission to America	150 0 0	
“	Grants to members	200 0 0	
			350 0 0
Nov. 7 —	Meath Election Petitions (on account of Costs), P. A. Chance, M. P.	200 0 0	
1893			
Jan. 9 —	Clare Election Petition (on account of Costs), P. A. Chance, M. P.	250 0 0	
			450 0 0
“	Cablegrams	17 13 0	
“	Interest on overdrafts	3 18 9	
“	Balance to next account	104 14 7	
			£12,551 6 4

We have examined the foregoing Account, with the Books and Vouchers of above Fund, and certify the same to be correct.

8th December, 1893. KEVANS AND SON,
Chartered Accountants, 22 Dame street, Dublin.

HOME RULE FUND.

ACCOUNT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

FROM 10th MARCH, 1893, TO 31st OCTOBER, 1893.

RECEIPTS.

To subscriptions published in “Freeman's Journal
and National Press”:

IRELAND		£4,026 12 7
ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND		967 3 3
Date of Publication, 1893.		
AMERICA —		
April 11 —	Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania, per Rev. A. M'Andrews	£23 10 0
“ 20 —	T. Coleman, Laurenceburg, Indiana	2 0 0
May 25 —	Rev. M. J. Heban, Ashley, Pa	12 6 0
July 13 —	Andres Geoghagan, Estancia Emmett, Buenos Ayres	2 0 0
		39 16 0

CANADA —			
April 3 —	Montreal, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	£100 0 0	
" 3 —	Ottawa, per same	203 17 0	
" 11 —	Winnipeg Home Rule Association, per P. D. O'Phelan	23 6 11	
" 22 —	Ottawa, per Hon. E. Blake, M. P.	203 17 0	
" 29 —	Winnipeg Home Rule Association, per P. D. O'Phelan	8 15 2	
			£539 16 1
AUSTRALIA —			
April 13 —	Irish National Federation, Adelaide, per John Dillon, M. P.		130 0 0
NEW ZEALAND —			
April 3 —	Irish National Federation, Wellington, per P. M'Alister		14 10 0
AFRICA —			
July 27 —	Irishmen of Kimberley, per M. Cornwall		66 12 6
	Miscellaneous		38 10 0
			£5,823 0 5

LESS,			
Subscriptions acknowledged in error, transferred to —			
	Irish National Federation	£5 0 0	
	Irish Parliamentary Fund	119 10 0	
			124 10 0
			£5,698 10 5

PAYMENTS.

By Evicted Tenants Committee, J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., and David Sheehy, M. P.	1,200 0 0
" Treasurers Parliamentary Party, J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., John Barry, M. P., and Alfred Webb, M. P.	1,142 8 6
" Irish National Federation (for Registration and General Expenses)	1,350 0 0
" Election Expenses	391 1 3
" Law Costs	210 5 0
" Travelling Expenses	18 0 0
" Printing and Stationary	17 10 5
" Advertising	46 9 11
" Office Expenses	15 8 8½
" T. Curran, M. P., Repayment on account of Loan	750 0 0
" Cash in Hands of Secretary	9 15 5½
" Balance in Bank	547 11 2
	£5,698 10 5

We have examined the foregoing Account, with the Books and Vouchers of the above Fund, and certify the same to be correct.

8th December, 1893. KEVANS AND SON,
Chartered Accountants, 22 Dame street, Dublin.

EVICTED TENANTS FUND.

ACCOUNT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

FROM 14th OCTOBER, 1892, TO 31st OCTOBER, 1893.

RECEIPTS.

To subscriptions published in "Freeman's Journal and National Press":—

	IRELAND	£15,856 4 11
	ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND	855 4 6
Date of Publication.		

AMERICA —

Dec. 1 —	A Friend, per "Irish Catholic"	£2 0 0
" 24 —	John Conroy, Inalip, Washington	2 0 0
Feb. 25 —	Rev. G. Clarkson, Milford, Michigan	1 0 0

Feb. 25 — Rev. M. Fleming, Hastings, Michigan . . .	£1 0 0	
Mar. 16 — Woonsocket, Rhode Island, per Rev. M. M'Cabe, through his Grace the Archbishop of Dublin . . .	302 9 0	£308 9 0
NEW ZEALAND —		
Feb. 3 — Irish National Federation, Auckland, per M. J. Sheehan, through John Dillon, M. P.	£36 2 6	
" 15 — Do . . . do . . . do . . .	6 0 0	42 2 6
Anonymous, &c		274 0 0
		£17,336 0 11

PAYMENTS.

By Evicted Tenants Committee, J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., and David Sheehy, M. P.	16,195 17 8
" Office Expenses, Dublin and Cork	332 15 3
" Convention Expenses	85 19 2
" Advertising	196 3 6
" Printing and Stationary	93 9 4
" National Fund (to close)	60 17 4
" Balance	370 18 8
	£17,336 0 11

We have examined the foregoing Account, with the Books and Vouchers, and certify the same to be correct.

8th December, 1893. KEVANS AND SON,
Chartered Accountants, 22 Dame street, Dublin.

EVICTED TENANTS COMMITTEE.

The Evicted Tenants Committee was appointed by the Committee of the Irish Parliamentary Party, and consists of Messrs. Michael Davitt, William O'Brien, M. P., J. F. X. O'Brien, M. P., John Dillon, M. P., and David Sheehy, M. P., of whom Messrs. J. F. X. O'Brien and David Sheehy are also Treasurers.

The following is the Audit of the Expenditure of the Fund voted to the Committee:—

ACCOUNT OF RECEIPTS AND PAYMENTS

FROM 1st OCTOBER, 1892, TO 31st OCTOBER, 1893.

RECEIPTS.

To Balance in National Bank	£149 0 8
" Balance on hand	1 0 0
	£150 0 8
" Evicted Tenants Fund	16,195 17 8
" Irish Parliamentary Fund	1,800 0 0
" Home Rule Fund	1,200 0 0
" Grants forfeited and returned	4 12 0
" Overdraft, Hibernian Bank	14 17 3
	£19,365 7 7

PAYMENTS.

By Expenditure on Evicted Tenants:—	
Grants	£17,550 1 0
Grant in aid of Tottenham Settlement	280 0 0
Law Costs	893 11 1
Building and Repairing Houses	147 4 4
Rents of Farms retained for use of Tenants, Taxes, Insurance, Office, and Miscellaneous Expenses	486 4 2
	£19,357 0 7
" Cheque Books	3 15 0
" Balance in National Bank	£3 12 0
" do on hand	1 0 0
	4 12 0
	£19,365 7 7

We have examined the foregoing Account, with the Books and Vouchers, and certify the same to be correct.

9th December, 1893. KEVANS AND SON,
Chartered Accountants, 22 Dame street, Dublin.

